

Lead Entity Advisory Group
July 26, 2004
Ellensburg, WA
Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	Shirley Solomon, Skagit Watershed Council, Chair Doug Osterman, King County WRIA 9, Vice Chair Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE Amy Hatch-Winecka, Thurston, Mason LE Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
Others Present:	Roy Huberd, Pierce County Dave McClure, Klickitat County Brad Johnson, Asotin County CD Terry Bruegman, Kim Bredensteiner, Island County LE Stephanie Cotton, Snohomish/Stillaguamish LE Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB Kristi Lynett, WDFW Brian Walsh, WDFW
LEAG Members Absent:	Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board John Sims, Quinault Nation LE (excused)
Introduction	Shirley Solomon welcomed the group to the LEAG meeting and provided an explanation of what transpired at the last LEAG session. In summary, there were some fundamental issues that emerged about the group's role and structure that needed to be resolved. The purpose of today's meeting is to work for resolution of these issues so that the group can move forward and build organizational effectiveness.
Purpose and Role	Jim Fox relayed various opinions of SRFB members regarding LEAG's role. Two LEAG models emerged from conversations with three SRFB members; 1) a representative policy forum and 2) a decision-making, politically active body that represents the voice of all LEs. The three members of the SRFB do not feel that LEAG needs to come to consensus on all issues, but that all views should be captured in the summary notes and verbally to the Board. The three SRFB members expressed their desire that LEAG gather opinions from non-LE coordinators throughout the watersheds (i.e., Citizen and Technical Committee members, project sponsors). Jim later said that the SRFB wants a LEAG voice for all Lead Entities.

LEAG discussed this feedback from SRFB members extensively. It was acknowledged that to provide a voice for all Lead Entities, LEAG would need to be very proactive in soliciting input from all Lead Entities, that actual conversations would need to occur with each Lead Entity on the issues before LEAG. It was also acknowledged that this operational approach would require more horsepower from a combination of IAC and WDFW staff. LEAG agreed that a passive model would not work.

It was also acknowledged that each Lead Entity should not give up its opportunity to advocate for itself in front of the SRFB.

The conversation ended in confirmation of LEAG's existing Purpose Statement. The LEAG Purpose Statement is in the Policy and Procedures Manual. It states, "The Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) is created to enhance the Lead Entity Program by creating a forum where lead entity issues can be explored and the communication between lead entities and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), the Department of Fish and Wildlife, other state agencies and interested groups is improved."

LEAG agreed to an editorial change (to make the statement a verbally-correct sentence) to the Purpose Statement as follows:

"The Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) is created to enhance the Lead Entity Program by creating a forum for exploring lead entity issues and improving the communication between lead entities and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), the Department of Fish and Wildlife, other state agencies and interested groups."

The afternoon session focused on "re-calibrating" the LEAG effort in order to be an effective group in communicating among all Lead Entities and the SRFB, and in making consensus decisions on Lead Entity issues.

LEAG reviewed the work of the LEAG retreat in April. At this retreat, a number of specific roles were identified as part of the work plan process. The following list of topics which emerged from that session were adopted as additions to the LEAG purpose statement:

- Actively Advise Agencies on LE Issues
- Promote the LE Program
- Make Recommendations
- Foster Stronger Relationships Between LE, RFEGs, & Other Program
- Communicate All LE Voices to SRFB/WDFW
- Seek Interchange of Information Among Lead Entities

Participation and Structure

The question was then posed, *How can LEAG better meet the SRFB's expectations?*

- Memos, issue papers, and agenda topics brought forward to LEAG

need to explicitly lay out the options or directions for LEAG's recommendations. Issues need to be framed clearly with specific desired input from LEAG identified.

- LEAG needs to be explicit about staff assistance. WDFW and IAC staff need to perform all reasonable requests on time and thoroughly. WDFW and IAC staff need to integrate their work to better support LEAG and accommodate its schedule.
- SRFB members may be encouraged to attend specific, SRFB focused LEAG meetings.
- LEAG's new "buddy system" needs to be taken seriously. This method of communicating to all LE Coordinators before and after every LEAG meeting can be an extremely valuable tool if adhered to.
- LEAG notes need to be incorporated into the SRFB packet. Because of poor timing, often a verbal statement at the SRFB meeting is the only report provided.
- LEAG members need to come prepared for every LEAG meeting. This means that all documents provided in advance will have been thoroughly read, buddy comments have been captured, and members show up on time and regularly. Longer LEAG meetings may be required if the type and amount of agenda topics require extended discussions.
- LEAG decision-making should not be based on a Yes/No vote, but rather on a consensus continuum. (see Appendix B; Seeking Consensus)
- Members also stressed the need for clear communication from the SRFB on what is needed from LEAG

A consensus was reached that LEAG should remain 9 appointed members selected by anticipated commitment to participation as well as diversity (East/West, Urban/Rural, Coordinator/Committee Member, Government/Non-Government, Large LE/Small LE...)

Recognition of the Chair

LEAG presented Shirley Solomon with a card, a music CD, and a photograph in recognition for the outstanding work she has done on behalf of salmon habitat restoration and her service to LEAG as Chair the past year. Shirley is stepping down from LEAG after this month, but she expressed her deep appreciation for the group.

Decision / Recommendation Process

A consensus was reached that LEAG follows the suggestion laid out by staff in the LEAG Issue Paper (see attachment). "For major policy issues, LEAG should strive for consensus, but allow for majority/minority points of view where consensus is not attainable. For less critical issues of a programmatic nature, LEAG could consider a range of views. Finally, some issues may be deemed to be of minor importance, too contentious, or too complicated. For these situations, LEAG could choose not to make a recommendation. By emphasizing a consensus-based approach, LEAG

meetings may take more time, especially when there are numerous policy issues to discuss and resolve.”

**Meeting
Logistics**

A consensus was reached that LEAG meetings be rotated between SeaTac and Ellensburg, with two successive meetings in SeaTac followed by a meeting in Ellensburg.

**Selection of
LEAG Officers**

The agenda for this meeting did not include the selection of officers – that will occur at the next LEAG meeting. LEAG members asked Brian Walsh to assist with the process by conducting a telephone survey of LEAG members to see who would be interested in serving as the Chair and Vice Chair for LEAG.

**Budget
Update**

Jim Fox provided his perception of the Legislature’s perception of the LE Program and the larger watershed health world and potential implications for next biennium’s budgets. Many planning processes will be moving towards implementation (Salmon Recovery Plans and 2514 Watershed plans) by next July. The Legislature, therefore, assumes that funds for planning should decline. (Many of them see “planning” as work performed by LEs, RFEGs, WPU’s, and Regional Boards.) They will not want to fund all current infrastructure and, without proactive movement, decisions affecting these programs may be decided behind the scenes in the legislative budget process. It is especially important to show decision-makers how the LE Program is efficient and effective at getting the highest priority projects on the ground. The Legislature is also exploring the idea of combining funding mechanisms into a “Watershed Health Board”.

Jim said that there are two forums of discussion regarding the future construct of the salmon planning and implementation process—the legislature and the governor’s office. He said some Regional Boards want to remain in place for implementation, and that there is interest in integrating water supply/2514 implementation with 2496 implementation. The biennial budget is shaping up like this:

Regional Boards: \$5 million
Lead Entities: \$3.25 million
RFEGs: \$2 million
Planning Units: \$8 million

Jim posed the question: Is this the right infrastructure for implementation? LEAG did not discuss this issue further.

Jim also reported that there were 193 habitat projects proposed for \$55 million during the 5th SRFB funding cycle.

**NEXT MEETING:
September 2, 2004, SeaTac**

